

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 4, 2008, the Examiner noted that claims 1-14 were pending, and rejected claims 1-14. Claims 1-10, 11 and 13 have been amended, claim 12 has been canceled, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-11, 13 and 14 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. section 101 as non-statutory. Claim 12 has been cancelled. Claim 11 has been amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments and it is submitted it satisfies the requirements of the statute. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 9 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Brady. Page 5 of the Office Action rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Brady and Benton. Page 5 of the Office Action rejects claim 6 as obvious over Brady and Piccinelli. Page 6 of the Office Action rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Brady and Kakinami. Page 7 of the Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Brady and Hu.

Brady discusses a system that tracks vehicles on a roadway and classifies each one of them into ten "angle sets" using angle components of the objects so that an icon can be assigned to each vehicle.

In contrast, the invention of claim 1 has a recognition process that recognizes "a character pattern of a number plate of the mobile object, an image of a front view of the mobile object or an image of a driver of the mobile object". This is completely different from the approach taken by Brady.

Benton, Piccinelli, Kakinami and Hu add nothing to Brady with respect to the features of claim 1 discussed above.

Claims 10, 11 and 13 also emphasize the features of claim 1.

It is submitted that the independent claims distinguish over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 4 calls extracting "two partial images from the high-resolution image captured by the high-resolution camera, and generates a video picture by alternately inserting the two partial images as respective low-resolution images, and said detection device detects the mobile object using the generated video picture". That is a video is generated from the two images.. The Examiner points to Benton for this feature at col. 3, lines 27-40. This text states:

The apparatus of the present invention can receive input video data from at least two sources. In the described embodiment, these sources are a targeting pod's Target Acquisition FLIR (Forward Looking Infra Red) System (TAFS) and a Maverick Missile (MAV). The apparatus of FIG. 1 alternately receives a video image from the MAV and from the TAFS in scaled, pixel-serial, bit-parallel format, along with field and line sync signals FSYNCH and LSYNCH (not shown), and a clock signal CLK in accordance with the type of the video source (MAV or TAFS). A MAV/TAFS indicator line indicates whether a MAV or TAFS video image is being input. In a preferred embodiment, input video data from both sources is 8 bits in length, although other types of input data may have other bit formats. The pixels of the input video data preferably are scaled by a scaling apparatus (not shown) before being input to the apparatus of the current invention. After scaling, a pixel of MAV video data and a pixel of TAFS video data represent a same field of view, i.e., each MAV pixel and each TAFS pixel represents a substantially identical area. This scaling process is important for operation of the correlation process described below.

(Benton, col. 3, lines 27-47)

This text discusses receiving video not generating video. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101. It is also submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 5, 2008

By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501